

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

LJUBO SKRBIC,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF WEST PALM BEACH,

Defendants.

Case No. C23-934RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte*. *Pro se* Plaintiff Ljubo Skrbic, a resident of Palm Beach, Florida, brings this action against the “Code Inforcement [sic] Department” of the City of West Palm Beach, Florida. Dkt. #6 at 2. Plaintiff’s form Complaint has a section for “basis for jurisdiction” indicating that he is bringing a § 1983 claim. *Id.* at 4. While the Complaint is unclear, it appears that Plaintiff seeks \$100,000 and dismissal of a code violation fee. The underlying dispute has something to do with the City imposing a code violation against Plaintiff for evicting a tenant from Plaintiff’s rental property. An earlier court proceeding determined that “[t]his is Landlord tenant case.” *Id.* at 6. Plaintiff appears to be attempting to challenge a Florida state court proceeding.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), civil actions in federal court may be brought, with limited exceptions, only in the judicial district where defendants reside or in a district in which a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim(s) occurred. When a case is filed in the wrong district, the district court “shall dismiss, or if it be in the interest of justice, transfer such case to any district or division in which it could have been brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). This case has nothing to do with the Western District of Washington; it appears clear that the parties and the events all take place in Florida. The Court concludes that the Western District of Washington is not a proper venue for Plaintiff and the Court is empowered to dismiss this case for improper venue. Given the nature of Plaintiff’s claims, the Court believes that dismissal rather than transfer of venue is appropriate.

In Response to this Order, Plaintiff must write a short statement telling the Court why this case should not be dismissed for improper venue under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). This Response may not exceed six double-spaced (6) pages. Attachments or amended pleadings are not permitted. The Court will take no further action in this case until Plaintiff has submitted this Response.

Accordingly, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff shall file a Response to this Order to Show Cause containing the detail above no later than thirty (30) days from the date of this Order. Failure to file this Response will result in case dismissal.

DATED this 12th day of June, 2023.



RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE